

**REMARKS**

Claims 48-50, 52, 55-61, 63, 67-69, 71, 73 and 75-79 are active.

Applicant's attorney, Gordon D. Coplein, respectfully thanks the Examiner for his courtesy in granting a telephone interview on April 13, 2004.

During the interview, the outstanding points of the Final Rejection of January 16, 2004 were discussed. These basically were objections to Figs. 1 and 6 of the drawings and language in clauses (a) and (c) of each of the independent claims 48, 57 and 69. All of the other claims depend in one way or another from these independent claims. No prior art is cited against any of the claims.

A proposed new Fig. 1 in informal form was presented to the Examiner for consideration and tentatively approved. This is represented in the new Fig. 1 submitted herewith. To explain Fig. 1, reference is made to the "marked" up copy of the Specification previously submitted. Pages 10-12 of the marked up copy describe that the screen 5 has an image as directed by a BDS matrix, i.e., a matrix of BDS elements. Embodiments of the BDS element are shown in Figs. 2 and 3.

A sequence sending of blocks is performed by selectively applying voltage to deflectors of the BDS matrix (page 12, lines 4-6) by row 16 and column 17 lines (page 13, lines 1-2). Fig. 1 is a general structure for both parallel and sequential sending as both rely on the common set of structural elements — complementary screen 1 image plane, BDS matrix 5, and differ only in construction of BDS elements used (either electrically controllable deflectors or light dividing elements with controllable modulators). The structural elements and functioning described in the Specification are shown in new Fig. 1.

Polarizer 4 is an optional element and does not direct the image

As to Fig. 6, prior Fig. 4(b) showed elements with numbers 23, described in text (page 20, line 3), as lenses. At the same time, the same number 23 was used in Fig. 6 for focusing elements. Reference number 23 of Fig. 4(b) is proposed to be changed to "33", and in the Substitute Specification filed April 4, 2003, at page 16, line 9 a correction is made changing "the number of lenses 23" to "the number of lenses 33".

It is respectfully requested that the new Fig. 1 and the correction to Fig. 4(b) be accepted. No new matter is added.

As to the claims, referring to clause (a) of the independent claims 48, 57 and 69, clause (a) is proposed to be amended to clarify the language. As explained to the Examiner, the screen 1 has an array of light emitting or light modulating devices forming an array of N pixels. From the array of N pixels, raster elements are generated. In turn, copies are made of the raster elements to form P blocks of such raster elements. The proposed amendment to clause (a) of the independent claims now sets this forth.

As to clause (c), consider that there is an array of modulators and (an array of) P blocks of raster elements. The modulation of the P blocks of raster elements is independent of each other and one modulator of the array of modulations modulates the raster elements of a respective one of the P blocks.

In clause (d) of claim 57, certain language is proposed to be deleted to make the claim read more clearly. In line 1 of claim 50, an editorial change is made.

It is believed that the claim language is now in proper form. No new issues have been raised.

An earnest effort has been made to overcome the Examiner's objections. It is believed that all of the objections have been addressed.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to resolve any questions or problems with the amendment. The undersigned can be reached at 770-393-2820.

The amendment should be entered since it clearly places the application in condition for allowance. It does not raise any new issues since it only corrects language objections to the claims and objections to the drawings.

If the amendment is not entered for the purpose of placing the application in condition for allowance, then its entry is requested for purposes of appeal.

Application No.: 08/995,715

12

Docket No.: 00971/000D319-US0

Prompt and favorable action is requested.

Dated: April 16, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Gordon D. Coplein  
Gordon D. Coplein

Registration No.: 19,165

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

Attachments

{W:\00971\000d319us0\00168178.DOC\*00971000d319US0\* }